

1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

6411

string, could be opened to the vital ice-free port of Whittier in 2 weeks.

The Red Cross marshaled 25 volunteers as medical helpers in a stepped-up drive to administer antityphoid vaccine and forestall the ever-present danger of epidemic from fouled water.

At Johnson City, Tex., President Lyndon Johnson received word of the minimum \$500 million needs of the stricken 49th State.

"Everything necessary must be done," Mr. Johnson declared.

Alaska's Senators appealed for aid. Immediately, the Housing and Home Finance Agency in Anchorage ordered a moratorium on connections of FHA and VA home loans. The Internal Revenue Service made hasty arrangements to permit stricken residents to get income tax writeoffs this year on losses.

Insurance firms said there was little earthquake and tidal wave insurance in the State.

## BAD BEATING

The fishing industry, mainstay of the Alaskan economy, took a "hell of a beating," officials said. Ninety-foot boats hurled hundreds of yards inland and the almost numberless docks and wharfs ripped to pieces attested to that. The big salmon and crab canneries at Kodiak were shut down.

Mr. Johnson ordered Federal officials to "proceed as rapidly as possible to prepare relief programs for Alaska."

Jobs of thousands were wiped out in the quake. There were 4,500 to 5,000 jobs lost in Anchorage alone. The Red Cross said as many as 1,000 families required assistance. The homeless in Anchorage alone numbered 2,000.

## PROGRAM FOR U.S. ARMY FORCES IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would like to have the attention of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

I should like to say preparatory to propounding a question to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that the American people are greatly indebted to the Senator from Georgia for the years of dedicated service he has rendered as chairman of the Armed Services Committee. In my judgment, the security of the United States is as strong as it is today in no small measure because of the statesmanship and leadership of the Senator from Georgia as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I hope that is not a preface to a request, but I thank the Senator for the kind statement.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Georgia is seldom wrong. He is correct in the assumption which he just fleetingly harbored in that brilliant mind of his, for I rise to praise, and I also rise to beg for assistance from the Armed Services Committee. Under the rules of the Senate, it is appropriate for me to address an inquiry to any agency of the Senate, which each Senate committee is. The appropriate official to whom to direct a request is the chairman of the committee.

I address two inquiries to the Senator from Georgia. I should like to have help from the Armed Services Committee in obtaining official information from the Department of Defense, particularly the

Secretary of Defense. I have been in conversation with reliable correspondents who are disturbed at what they say are leaks. I do not know whether there are leaks or not. I should like to have the chairman of the Armed Services Committee obtain for me, if he would, from the Department of Defense all information as to what its plans are, to the extent that any plans exist, sending more American Armed Forces to South Vietnam.

Correspondents tell me that their leak indicates that the Department of Defense intends to secretly move marines trained for guerrilla warfare to South Vietnam.

As one Member of the Senate, I shall continue to press at every source I can reach for full public disclosure of the Defense Department's operations in South Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available in the morning hour to the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. As I was saying, Mr. President, I am going to continue to press at every source I can reach for full public disclosure of the operations of the Defense Department in South Vietnam. I will not accept the old "top secret" excuse—the excuse that we must keep top secret the maneuverings of the Defense Department. In this historic debate, we have reached the point where the American people are entitled to know. If anyone questions the soundness of my position that they are entitled to know and that they want to know, let him read the letters from the American people that I had printed last night in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They show the rising ground swell of resentment over the operations of the Defense Department in South Vietnam.

I also seek to obtain from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, for the benefit of the Senate, assurance from the Defense Department that the Senate will be kept informed immediately—and that means day by day—of reports on the casualties of Americans in South Vietnam, including the number of wounded, for the American people are entitled to know immediately how many die and how many are wounded day by day in what I consider McNamara's war in South Vietnam—a war which, in my judgment, cannot be justified on the basis on which it is being conducted.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I second the request the Senator from Oregon has made of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL]. My mail is very much like the mail of the Senator from Oregon which he placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday. Since I made a speech on this subject, some 3 weeks ago, in the Senate, I have received more than 200 letters

on this subject from all parts of the Union; and in the great majority of them—in fact close unanimity—the writers asked that our men be withdrawn from the firing line in South Vietnam, where—allegedly—they are serving as "advisers" but are actually in combat. I have received about 200 letters in support of my position, and only 4 in favor of carrying on as we have been or going even more extensively.

So I endorse the request of the Senator from Oregon. I consider it highly desirable that the people of the United States be kept fully informed. I consider it imperative that there be no concealment. It is important that under our system of government there be no illegitimate censorship especially in the Vietnam situation. Instead, there should be full disclosure to the public of all available information, including, of course, all casualties, especially American casualties.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, any Senate committee is the servant of the Senate. Also I consider a Senate committee to be an arm of assistance to any individual Senator. So I shall endeavor to obtain the information the Senator from Oregon has requested.

However, if I receive the information as classified information, I shall have to pass it on to the Senator on the same basis.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. RUSSELL. After receiving such information from the Department of Defense as classified information, I could not then reveal it publicly or transmit it under circumstances in which I believed it might be revealed.

Mr. MORSE. Of course, I understand that; and I have never attempted to take advantage of such a situation.

On the other hand, I would not wish to say to the American people that I believed the information should be classified if I believed that it should not be classified.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand.

I have heard reports that marines who had been specially trained in jungle and guerrilla warfare were being sent to South Vietnam. I made inquiry into that matter, and was told that none had been dispatched as of last Friday afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. I am interested in what the plans are.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall endeavor to obtain the information. However, I say to the Senator from Oregon that if I receive it, as classified information, I shall be compelled to treat it in the same way when I transmit it to him.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from Georgia that I shall observe all the proprieties in that connection. I always have done so.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand.

Certainly this is a trying situation for the American people. I have read almost all the letters on this subject that the Senator from Oregon had published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. I am glad I do not have to give an immediate answer in regard to South Vietnam.

Although it is very little satisfaction to say "I told you so", it happens that the Senator from Georgia was the only Senator present when the determination was made to extend the overwhelming military training assistance to that portion of Asia, and who opposed it. I could not see any strategic, tactical, or economic value in that area. Certainly from a military standpoint, in this day of missiles and long-range planes, that area has no significant value as a base for military operations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the statement just now made by the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is the most important statement that has been made to date by anyone in this country on the folly of the South Vietnam operations.

#### PROBLEMS OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may now address the Senate for possibly as long as 4 or 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the public wants to know—and it has a right to know—whether Bobby Baker was able to manipulate the Government of the United States.

The public wants to know—and it has a right to know—whether and to what extent the Senate of the United States and any individual U.S. Senators have been involved as pawns, partners, or otherwise, in Bobby Baker's self-enriching operations.

It is the responsibility of the Senate itself to see that the public gets this information. But it looks as though we are going to duck this responsibility.

It is hardly a sufficient answer for the Senate Rules Committee to tell us it cannot get this information, because Bobby Baker refused, on asserted constitutional grounds, to testify or produce his records.

Why could not the Rules Committee get this information by asking each Senator for it?

Specifically, why should not the Rules Committee ask each Member of the Senate:

First. Did you ever have any business or financial dealings, directly or indirectly, with Bobby Baker? If, so what were they?

Second. Did Bobby Baker ever give you, get for you, offer you or offer to get for you: any campaign contributions; any help in making up campaign deficits by gifts, purchase of tickets, or otherwise; any retainer or employment; any preferment in committee assignment or otherwise; anything of value?

A few simple questions along these lines—and the Rules Committee could easily frame the questions on the basis of the mass of information it has already received—should elicit the facts the public is entitled to have.

Yet, the chances that the Rules Committee will take any such action do not

seem promising. It seems clear that the majority party members of the committee are determined to force the inquiry to close down, although at this stage it has raised more questions than it has answered.

This committee majority says it has had enough. According to the chairman, it has already found "a pattern of activity which cannot be tolerated in the future." No good can come from further exposure of the "stink," was the way another Senator put it.

The committee majority is proceeding on the basis that the way to restore public confidence in the legislative branch is not to let the public and the press—or even the Members of the Senate, for that matter—know just how bad things have been. Understandably, the press and public are unable to follow the "Alice-in-Wonderland" logic behind this conclusion.

The shocking inadequacy of the inquiry is not merely a matter of ignoring the obvious questions raised by the testimony so far released and the unusual and questionable procedures followed with regard to some witnesses. Most glaring of all has been the committee's reluctance to view its responsibility as embracing the conduct of Members of the Senate themselves, and its obvious perpetuation of the double standard which Congress has long practiced—one standard for all others, another for its Members. A few years ago, for example, we acted to clarify and strengthen conflict-of-interest statutes as they apply to the executive branch. But at that time there was scarcely any mention of the problems of conflict of interest among Members of Congress.

In recent months we have heard much talk of standards of conduct for Senate employees. I hope we are not now going to impair further the standing of Congress by concentrating on problems of staff conduct and ignoring those of Senators.

Some see overwhelming difficulties in the way of dealing with conflict-of-interest problems in the legislative branch.

They point to the fact that Members of Congress are elected and responsible to their constituents. It is true, too, that the Senate is composed of coequals, reluctant to hold each other to account. Certainly, I recognize that it is not practicable to require a Member of Congress to divest himself of all personal interest that might present, or appear to present, a conflict of interest with his public duties.

But while these and other factors make for a somewhat special situation, there is still a way of dealing with it, I believe. That is by applying the principle of disclosure to the personal financial interests of Members of Congress and top congressional staff. For a number of years I and several of my colleagues have sponsored legislation to do this.

Early in the last session, I, together with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and subsequently the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART],

reintroduced a bill to require regular public disclosure of sources of income and gifts and financial transactions by elected as well as high-appointed officials and top staff in both the legislative and executive branches.

Following passage of Senate Resolution 2112 directing the Rules Committee inquiry, the Senator from Oregon and I wrote to the chairman urging consideration of the provisions of our bill as a part of its study. We pointed out that:

Had the requirements of our bill been in effect, the Senate would not have had to depend on outside sources to alert it to a situation which reflects on the integrity of the Senate itself. Indeed, had our bill been law, the situation might not have arisen at all.

In his reply, the chairman noted that the terms of the resolution do—

not mean that the desirable objectives of S. 1261 and related proposals could not receive the appropriate attention of the committee in due course.

I believe we have reached "due course."

More than ever, the public expects action from the Senate to make clear its own adherence to the highest standards of probity and ethical conduct. A recent Gallup poll demonstrated that 65 percent of the American people today favor legislation which would require Members of Congress to make public disclosure of their financial holdings each year. Support for our disclosure proposal is not confined to any one section of the country, according to the poll results. In no part of the country did less than 63 percent favor public reporting of financial assets and holdings by Members of the Congress.

In 1958, the Senate considered a resolution approving a code of ethics for Government service. The then Senator Lyndon B. Johnson said about that proposal:

The committee understands and intends that this resolution apply to every servant of the public, whether he be the President, a Member of Congress, a lifelong career employee or an employee engaged only on a temporary basis to expedite the movement of mail during the Christmas rush.

The committee does not subscribe to nor could it support any code of principles that applied only to some and not to others. It believes there is no room in a great democracy such as ours for any set of double standards.

The time has come to put this principle into practice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President—

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. In a moment. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Reluctant Dragons," published in the New York Times on March 25; an editorial entitled "Premature Curtain," published in the Newark Evening News on March 26; an editorial entitled "Right to the Whole Truth," published in the Washington Post on March 30; a column entitled "T.R.B. From Washington," published in the New Republic, March 28; a column entitled "Damaging Consequences of the Baker Case," by James